

Message

---

**From:** Nate Bello [bello@wra-ca.com]  
**Sent:** 4/30/2015 11:36:25 PM  
**To:** Aaron Allen [aaron.o.allen@usace.army.mil]; Pankratz, Shannon L SPL [Shannon.L.Pankratz@usace.army.mil]; Swenson, Daniel P SPL [daniel.p.swenson@usace.army.mil]; Mahdavi, Sarvy [Mahdavi.Sarvy@epa.gov]; Zimmerman, Jan@Waterboards [jan.zimmerman@waterboards.ca.gov]; David Lawhead [David.Lawhead@wildlife.ca.gov]; Julie Beeman [JBeeman@vcsenvironmental.com]; Tracey Brownfield [tracey@landveritas.com]; Tim DeGraff [degraff@wra-ca.com]; Keelie Rocker [KRocker@vcsenvironmental.com]  
**Subject:** Petersen Ranch Meeting-Monday May 4  
**Attachments:** Engineering Memo on Design Approach.pdf; Exhibit B-1 20150429.pdf; Grazing Map sm 20150430.pdf; Mitigation Ratio Setting Checklist 4-28-15.pdf; Petersen Ranch Site Exclusions with Figs 4-30-15 sm.pdf; Petersen Ranch Crediting email.pdf; Upper Piru Creek proposed watersheds.pdf

Hello all,

Attached to this email are several items for our meeting next Monday.

1. A map depicting the setback cattle exclusion fencing. Based on the literature research we discussed at our last meeting we saw that cattle exclusion buffers as small as 25 feet were effective at preserving water quality from areas of dense cattle concentrations. Based on input from regional board during our last meeting we reached out to the RWQCB staff working on the draft Grazing regulations/guidelines, however no standards or references were available. In reviewing the standards and policies adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (which has some of the strictest water quality standards in the state) we discovered they require a 35-foot buffer from livestock holding areas. In this figure we have used a 35-foot setback from the edge of the more mesic wetland and riparian habitats throughout the bank.
2. An updated 404 service area figure showing the eastern portion of the Upper Piru service area included, and a figure showing the Upper Piru HUC-12s that we included in the service area. We determined the boundary using the eastern HUC-12s which have similar habitats.
3. A memo and maps describing the exclusion areas, and expected use of those areas.
4. A memo from the hydrologist/engineer detailing the proposed restoration activities on Elizabeth lake and explaining assessment of the potential to use the biostabilization techniques from the Regional General Permit.
5. An email from Land Veritas to the Corps proposing a revised crediting methodology.
6. A track changes version of the Mitigation Ratio Setting Checklist instructions for the Bank that include suggested treatment of the Bank's credits, but allowing other treatments for impacts to pristine resources.

Look forward to seeing you all on Monday,

Nate

---

**Nathan Bello** | Conservation Biologist/Planner | d: 415.524.7238 | o: 415.454.8868 x 1800 | c: 916.508.4993 | bello@wra-ca.com

**WRA, Inc.** | www.wra-ca.com | 2169-G East Francisco Blvd., San Rafael, CA 94901 | San Diego | Fort Bragg | Denver